

## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. All other claims remain unchanged. The application now includes claims 1-4, 6-11, and 17-18.

All claims were rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The undersigned disagrees and is of the opinion that having the curvature of the lens being based on the diameter of the bottle cap would be well understood by those of skill in the art particularly in view of the teachings on page 7 lines 9-25. However, to advance prosecution of the case and to either place it in immediate condition for allowance or to reduce the number of issues for appeal, the “based on” language has simply been eliminated from claim 1, as this language is not required to distinguish the prior art of record. Due to the reduction in issues which may require appeal, entry of this amendment at this time is appropriate.

Claims 1-3, 7-11 and 18 are rejected as being obvious over Owens; claim 4 is rejected as being obvious over a combination of Owens and Towns; and claim 17 is rejected as being obvious over a combination of Owens and Harris. Each of these rejection is traversed.

While the undersigned does not agree that the Owens device can be used as a bottle cap, or that certain features of the recited claims do not provide patentable weight to the claimed method, the undersigned notes that the claimed method is not obvious over any of the references of record, alone or in combination. In particular, the claimed method is focused on a method of making bottle caps, and requires

“selecting a radius of curvature for at least one of an upper or lower convex surface of a top portion of each bottle cap of a plurality of bottle caps wherein different radiuses are selected for different diameter bottle caps of said plurality of bottle caps” (emphasis added)

As the Examiner recognizes, Owens does not show or discuss making bottle caps (hence the reasoning that the Owens device could be used as bottle cap-to which the undersigned disagrees). Rather, Owens shows making very precise lens devices for measuring instruments. At no point does Owens show or describe making a plurality of lenses where different diameter lenses have different radiuses

of curvature. Rather, each lens design shown or described in Owens is singular in nature, and all that might be suggested from Owens is that additional lenses of identical radiuses can be produced.

As discussed during the Interview, pill bottles distributed at pharmacies come in different sizes. The process disclosed and claimed in the invention allows a plurality of bottle caps to be produced, and to have the different bottle caps be pressed in a manner whereby different radiuses of curvature selected for each different sized cap are formed in the different sized caps. This type of methodology allows mass production of bottle caps which would be used on different sized pill bottles. The Owens methodology is not suited for mass production and is focused on making precision ocular devices which fit into specific instruments. Thus, while a radius may be provided in Owens, Owens by no means shows or suggests different radiuses being selected for different diameter bottle caps of said plurality of bottle caps. Similarly, neither Towns nor Harris suggest or make obvious this missing feature of Owens. That is, both Towns and Harris show manufacturing of one type of device (a bottle cap of one dimension in the case of Towns, and a lens for a storage device in the case of Harris). In view of this, no combination of Owen, Towns or Harris would make any of the claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Simply put, the high volume production of bottle caps having viewing devices that are fabricated by a pressing operation would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on any combination of references of the art of record.

With respect to the translucency requirement of claim 11, the previous response provided a text book definition demonstrating that a translucent material is known by those of ordinary skill in the art to have different properties than a transparent material. The Owens device would never be made with a translucent material.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1-4, 6-11, and 17-18 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local

telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

A provisional petition is hereby made for any extension of time necessary for the continued pendency during the life of this application. Please charge any fees for such provisional petition and any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Whitham  
Reg. No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.  
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340  
Reston, VA 20190

Tel. (703) 787-9400  
Fax. (703) 787-7557

Customer No.: 30743